

The Slateboard

UC-AFT
LOCAL 1966
UC-RIVERSIDE

Vol. 7

No. 1

Fall 1992

GREED AND GREAT MEN A YEAR IN THE LIFE OF UC

Cynthia Tuell, English

A MODEL FOR US ALL?

In June of 1991, our late chancellor, Rosemary Schraer, wrote a letter to UCR faculty and staff in which she declared, "...the year ahead is one of austerity in which reassessment and reorganization must lead to new forms of efficiency and productivity in every phase of our institutional operation...." The letter's main goal seemed to be to rouse a spirit of shared sacrifice and ascetic idealism, calling on us to give our all for education. Specifically, it seemed to urge departments not to lower faculty teaching loads at a time of financial crisis. In this mission, the letter failed: some departments lowered teaching loads in 1991 anyway, apparently unperturbed by so much executive blather.

"Why should faculty members give their all for education when presidents don't?" might be a good question. That year, UC's then-president David Gardner received a salary of \$307,900 -- about five times the average tenured faculty salary -- and a benefits package equal to another \$75,000. Part of his salary came in the form of "deferred income,"

a \$64,400 chunk which he'll receive this coming January. (The Board of Regents adopted "deferred income" plans for Gardner and other top UC executives in recent years because, according to a UC senior vice president, "a straight pay raise would have been politically unwise.")

HIS GOLDEN YEARS

Despite his high pay -- 30% higher than the mean for chief executives of large, "elite" universities -- Gardner announced his impending retirement last November. Though he was only 59, he said he was unable to continue in the job without his wife, who had recently died. Though Gardner must surely be grieving, he doesn't intend to spend his remaining years in sackcloth and ashes. Last March, in secret, the regents arranged to raise Gardner's annual pension from \$104,000 to \$120,000, and awarded him \$857,000 in pension vesting and deferred pay he would otherwise have forfeited because of his early retirement. (However, the man isn't actually retiring, in the way you and I might: he's got a new job starting January 1 as president of a philanthropic organization, and he'll be

pulling a salary there, too, probably a meager honorarium equal to only three or four times the average UC lecturer salary.)

PERKS ALL AROUND

UC vice presidents aren't tightening their belts too far these days either. They earn between \$180,000 and \$200,000, as much as 60% above the mean for similar positions in other universities. (UC chancellors and deans, though, earn somewhat less than their counterparts nation-wide, or did last year anyway, when the comparative study was done. Chancellor Schraer earned only \$143,700, making her the lowest paid chancellor in the system. However, perks and benefits for chancellors and deans at UC are much greater than the national average, making up somewhat for the relatively dismal pay.)

The perquisites that top UC executives receive are truly extraordinary. For instance, when Gardner was hired as president, the Board of Regents bought the house he had owned when he worked at his former job in Utah, loaned him the money to buy a new house near Oakland, and paid him \$48,000 a year to maintain his new home, since he refused to live in the official UC residence, claiming it was too small. (He also received a \$53,800 yearly housing allowance, in addition to the housing maintenance allowance, if I read the L.A. Times correctly.) Several UC vice presidents also receive \$40,000 plus in housing allowances, money which is added to their compensation base, thus increasing their potential pensions by a tidy sum.

It makes you wonder what these top dogs spend their salaries on. They get an allowance for housing, for a car and driver, for club dues, for entertainment, for estate planning and tax preparation. As a UC memorandum so movingly put it, "...senior University of California executives devote full effort to the institution and, therefore, often do not have the time to manage their personal financial affairs

adequately." (Do you think, under the same rationale, the university might cover my child care expense -- which, even for two kids, is a bargain compared to what they give the bigwigs for estate planning -- or at least reimburse me the \$40 a month I shell out to the guy who mows my lawn? Hey, I'm devoted too.)

Even the spouses of top executives get an allowance, apparently for standing around and looking spousal on state occasions. Mrs. Peltason, our new First Lady, will get \$38,000 this year, more than I will as a full-time teacher at UC. (I should have known, though: Daddy always told me a woman does better when she marries money, the old-fashioned way, than when she earns it.) What will they think of next? A red beans and rice allowance? An allowance for socks and shoes? We couldn't have the president of what Gardner called "one of the world's great intellectual treasure houses" walking around Oakland on gnarly old bare feet, now could we?

I haven't even mentioned the parties that were thrown with state money, the wedding receptions and first class travel arrangements paid for out of the UC budget and highlighted in the recent Post report on UC executive compensation. For example, Gardner once stayed at the expensive Four Season's Clift Hotel in San Francisco during a Regents' meeting only ten miles from his home office. Gardner valiantly defended executive travel, entertainment, and other expenses as "important work undertaken not for the benefit, convenience, or welfare of the individual officer, but for the benefit, convenience, and welfare of the University of California and, thus, ultimately, the people of California." Yes, society made him do it.

THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE

Responding to the Post report, the Joint Legislative Audit Committee in Sacramento told UC representatives that UC is risking the loss of public confidence and support by spending so

freely on executive high life. However, UC is constitutionally independent of the legislature, which can do little to control UC spending practices. The only power the legislature -- "the people of California," supposedly -- can wield is via appropriations. Regent Roy Brophy claims that Post's report of executive excess caused the legislature to cut \$30 million more than expected this year from the UC budget.

They'd already cut plenty last year and this, in the face of the recession, cuts which have hit students the hardest. In the past two years, student fees have increased 65% at UC. California student debt has increased 50% in that time. In this year's state budget, college financial aid programs have been reduced by 15%. Five qualified students now compete for every available Cal Grant, while two years ago the ratio was 3-1. For two years in a row, the number of African-Americans and Latinos enrolled as freshmen at UC has dropped, primarily because of the increase in fees.

BYE, BYE, SUCKERS

In his farewell address a few weeks ago, Gardner said, "I do not feel gloomy at all about the future of the University of California as the world's leading public university. I am gloomy ... about UC's ability over time to perform its historic role of assuring access to young people of talent irrespective of their ethnicity or socioeconomic status." (That sounds like a contradiction to me. A public university that can't assure access to the public it serves can't possibly be the best in the world: it's an outright failure.)

To close the budget gap UC faces this year and in the near future, Gardner proposes to cut access much further, to "downsize" the university. He proposes to reduce prospective enrollments by 16,000 over the next 3 to 5 years; to raise fees in the 1993-94 academic year by \$300-\$500; to ban sophomore year transfers by community college students; to lay off 2500 non-

teaching employees; to cut financing for library books and instructional materials; and to defer needed maintenance.

THE CORPORATE MODEL

In the face of the severe financial crisis we've been suffering for several years now, why did the Board of Regents agree to pay out such astonishing sums for executive compensation? According to Meredith Khachigian, chair of the Regents, UC needs to pay and perk as it does in order to "compete." (Does that mean that if we don't pay Gardner an enormous pension, some other university will?) Gardner too claimed, "UC has competed and continues to compete with ... 'elite institutions' because these are the world's leading universities. Once we choose not to compete with them, we will lose our edge, and over time UC will no longer be a world-class university."

But Gardner himself, who generally has been seen as a strong and capable president, was not hired away from an "elite institution." He came from the University of Utah. He wasn't a noted scholar either. He received his Ph.D. in education from UC Berkeley in 1966 and went immediately into UC administration, where he spent most of his career, except for ten years in Utah. He was the first UC president since 1899 not hired from within the system. Our new president, Jack Peltason, was formerly the chancellor at UC Irvine. And many other top administrators statewide and locally have spent their careers at UC. Why do we need to pay more than anyone else in order to promote our own?

Though the recent study I've been quoting from showed that UC does pay better than elite private institutions like Harvard, Stanford, and Cal Tech, UC Vice President Ronald Brady claimed that UC's salaries are 25-30% behind the competition. "We're having trouble recruiting the people we want," he said. "The people we want," it seems, can only be people in business, if people in academe are earning less than UC pays.

Why do we want people in business? Or are "the people we want" academics who are threatening to leave for greener corporate pastures? If so, I say, "Let 'em go. Who needs the profiteers anyway?" I suspect, though, that they're not really threatening to leave. I suspect most of them would have accepted lower salaries and many fewer perks early on, when they first moved into administration; but the Board of Regents, composed of the rich, who are different from you and me, just couldn't imagine how they could hire anyone who isn't an idiot for a sum lower than \$100 grand, bare minimum. And once these newly promoted top dogs started to see what life could be like up there, their notions of value began to reconstruct to suit those of theirmasters.

WHO CARES ABOUT UC?

Am I implying that academics, unlike businessmen, aren't motivated by ordinary greed? Well, I know they can be and often are, though I don't believe salaries and perks need to be astronomical in order to attract qualified people to these jobs. And anyway, yes, I do believe that academics are, or should be, less greedy than some other people. If we were out to get rich, why did we go into education in the first place? I am an ascetic idealist I guess, just what Chancellor Schraer wanted, what the whole system, Regents included, depends on in order to keep the University running. I believe there are rewards much greater than money for the work that we do, and that UC has a mission in society, one that I'm proud to be a part of. Despite my \$30,000 salary, after 14 years at UC and 20 years in the profession, despite the cruddy office I share with 28 other lecturers, despite our communal telephone that blocks toll calls to exotic places like Perris and San Bernardino, I know that I'm essential to UC, this world-class institution.

THE GREAT MAN THEORY

David Gardner and the Regents are operating under the discredited "Great Man" theory of history.

According to this theory, great men make everything happen. Great men made UC great, and without great men UC will sink into non-elite oblivion. How do you recognize a great man when you see one? By his salary, of course. The Great Man theory is horseshit, invented by men-who-would-be-great to justify the inordinate share of the social pie they claim for themselves. But who bakes the pie, after all? Who teaches the students, runs the labs, works in the library, trains the teachers, and writes the books that are UC?

You know the answer: we do. If we want to save it, to do anything to prevent the down-sizing that will cut first students and then faculty, first books and then librarians, shrinking UC down to a panoply of overseeing fat cats, a bunch of beautiful empty buildings, and a handful of celebrity teachers and elite students, we must join together and raise our collective voice. Right now, our union is poor and not very powerful. Even so, we've won rights and improved working conditions for the people we represent in ways that UC has fought very hard to prevent. We continue to make a difference, but it's a terrible uphill battle. We need your strength and your talents: please join us. For information about membership in the AFT, contact one of the officers listed on the last page of The Slateboard.

WHY BILL CLINTON DESERVES OUR SUPPORT

Deloy Simper, English

Following are some facts and observations given by AFT in support of Clinton's candidacy:

*** By the start of the 1990s, Arkansas had risen to rank third nationally in the percentage of its state budget devoted to K-12 and higher

education. Of Arkansas' general revenues, 80% are now spent on education (with 21% devoted to higher education)--well ahead of the national average.

*** Under Clinton, Arkansas has enjoyed the fifth highest rate of increase in higher education spending in the country.

*** With average teacher salaries ranked 50th in the early 1980s, Clinton successfully won salary increases that raised average pay nearly 77% in only nine years.

*** The percentage of Arkansas students going on to college has risen from about 36% (lowest in the nation) to over 50%, which is near the national average.

*** Clinton increased college financial aid to needy Arkansas students from \$1.5 million to \$11.1 million.

*** In 1991 Clinton developed a new Academic Challenge scholarship program that currently pays full tuition at any state college or university in Arkansas for every low- and middle-income student.

*** Clinton established a college bond program that allows parents and others to buy short- or long-term, non-taxable college bonds to help finance their children's education. In turn, the bonds help finance \$100 million in construction projects at many of the state's colleges and universities.

CALIFORNIA BALLOT PROPOSITIONS

The California Federation of Teachers, the state's AFT affiliate, makes the following recommendations on the November ballot propositions:

Proposition 155: School Bond Act of 1992 -- **SUPPORT**

Authorizes \$900 million in general obligation bonds for the construction, re-construction and modernization of K-12 schools. Voters passed a similar bond act in the June primary.

Proposition 156: Rail Passenger and Clean Air Bond Act of 1992 -- **SUPPORT**

Authorizes \$1 billion in general obligation bonds to acquire rights-of-way, make capital expenditures and purchase rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail and urban rail transit systems.

Proposition 157: Toll Highways, Termination of Tolls -- **NO RECOMMENDATION**

Proposition 158: Office of California Analyst -- **SUPPORT**

Creates an independent Office of California Analyst. This measure breaks the Legislative Analyst away from the Legislature and exempts it from expenditure limits imposed on lawmakers.

Proposition 159: Auditor General, Joint Legislative Audit Committee -- **SUPPORT**

Establishes the Office of the Auditor General, to conduct independent, non-partisan, professional audits as required by law or requested by the Legislature.

Proposition 160: Property Taxation; Veteran's Exemption; Surviving Spouse -- **NO RECOMMENDATION**

Proposition 161: Terminal Illness -- **NO RECOMMENDATION**

Proposition 162: Public Employees Retirement Systems -- **SUPPORT**

Grants authority over investment decisions, actuarial services and administration of public employees' retirement systems exclusively to a

system's board; requires that board to administer the system to assure prompt delivery of benefits; prevents the Legislature from changing the composition and selection methods of the board without the approval of voters in the jurisdiction where the public employees are employed; and provides that the board's duty to participants and beneficiaries takes precedence over any other duty.

Proposition 163: Taxation of Food Products -- OPPOSE

Prohibits new sales or use taxes on food products that are exempt from such taxation under existing statutes. It also adds a statute exempting candy, bottled water and snack foods from sales and use taxes imposed by the Legislature in 1991.

Proposition 164: Term Limits -- OPPOSE

Proposition 140, passed by voters in November 1990, imposed term limits on members of the state Legislature and on all constitutional officers, except the insurance commissioner. Now comes Proposition 164, to extend term limits to members of California's congressional delegation, including the two U.S. senators.

Proposition 165: Welfare, Budget Process -- OPPOSE

The most controversial ballot initiative of the fall campaign, this measure expands the power of the governor, giving him or her the authority to declare a fiscal emergency under specified conditions and to reduce expenditures to balance the budget. The governor would have the power to reduce state employee salaries and to order furloughs. The measure also eliminates or limits the cost-of-living adjustments, or COLAs, in AFDC, SSI/SSP and IHSS welfare programs, reduces AFDC by 10%, limits aid for new residents and provides school-attendance incentives.

Proposition 166: Basic Health Care -- OPPOSE

An initiative sponsored by the California Medical Association, it requires employers to provide basic health care coverage for employees and their dependents pursuant to a specified phase-in period; provides that employee contributions not exceed 2 % of their wages; eliminates duplicate coverage; and specifies the type of health care benefits, including prescription services. It also creates the Health Care Coverage Commission, with specified membership and duties.

Proposition 167: State Taxes -- SUPPORT

Increases tax rates for maximum personal income taxpayers and alternative minimum personal income taxpayers; temporarily suspends indexing on personal income taxes; boosts income tax rates for corporations and premium tax rates on insurers; and increases the tax liability on banks and corporations doing business within and outside California. It also provides for banks and corporations doing business within and outside California. It also provides for reappraisal of corporate-owned real property upon a specified change in ownership; imposes a new oil severance tax; and repeals the snack tax and reduction of renter's credit.

AFT ENDORSEMENTS IN STATE RACES

In the U.S. Senate and Congressional races, AFT endorses without exception the Democratic incumbents or challengers. The same is true in the California Senate and Assembly races, with a few exceptions. Republican candidates Jan Goldsmith (District 75, San Diego, Poway) and Doris Allen (District 67, Huntington Beach, Cypress) have received AFT endorsement. In two districts the AFT has made **no endorsement**: District 65,

Riverside, San Bernardino (where a Lyndon LaRouche worker is the Democratic candidate) and District 74, Escondido.

VOTE NOVEMBER 3

IT'S NOT THE LOAN, IT'S THE LABEL Library Accommodates Lecturers

At the beginning of the quarter, some lecturers renewing their library cards were told by circulation assistants that they were staff, not faculty. Although lecturers don't have much status at the University, we do have academic positions as non-Senate faculty, so the UC-AFT investigated the situation.

We found out from John Tanno, Associate University Librarian, that Senate faculty have been given year-long borrowing privileges. Since not all lecturers have year-long contracts (alas!), the library decided to limit the loan period for lecturers to one quarter. For most of us a quarter is probably long enough, but we don't want library cards, often used informally as proof of employment, labeled Staff.

After several meetings, the Library administration came up with a solution. Lecturers should bring their letters of appointment with them when renewing a library card. Those on contracts of a year or longer will be eligible for the Senate-faculty borrowing period; their cards will be labeled "Faculty." Those on quarterly contracts will receive a card labeled "Short-term Academic," and can borrow books for a quarter at a time.

Although the UC-AFT opposes distinctions between part-time and full-time, quarterly and year-long contracts, we understand that the

Library needs to get its books back and we accept its solution to the problem. We appreciate John Tanno's taking our complaint seriously and doing something about it.

IMPRESSIONS OF A REGENTS MEETING

Barbara Gable, English

On October 15, I took the bus to UCLA to observe my first UC Regents meeting. When I finally found the session, relocated to the luxurious, brand new Griffin Commons, it was already in progress. Passing the security inspection by assuring six or eight guards that I had no whistles or posters, I was allowed to enter and take a seat in the observers' section in a corner of a huge ballroom. Far away from the handful of observers, regents and chancellors, perhaps reassured by the magnificent edifices of UCLA that they were doing a marvelous job, sat at tables arranged in a large square. At one side were members of the press, and on another were dignitaries of some unspecified sorts.

Although visitors were handed a large packet of information about the gorgeous new campus facilities, nothing was given to observers about the meeting itself. At first it was difficult to figure out what was going on. I had expected to hear a discussion of fee increases and the tenth campus, topics that did arise in the afternoon session, but the morning meeting was devoted to three luminaries flown in from back east, no doubt with enormous honorariums, to address the regents and chancellors on running a university. Certainly these three men are successful in their fields and are respected on their own campuses, but I heard nothing enlightening, uplifting, or even informative all morning. A famous economist from Princeton gave a

standard Toastmaster speech on two kinds of change. The next speaker refused to be overly optimistic but offered little to support his sober outlook. These empty speeches were followed by a question and answer period giving the chancellors and regents (no one else is allowed to speak at these meetings) an opportunity to pick the brains of these three eminent scholars and administrators.

Most questions were as vague as the speeches that evoked them. The single specific question, asked of the president of the University of Maryland: "What are graduate and professional school fees at your university?" could not be answered exactly until a flunkey had found the figures.

Most striking about this keynote session was a consistently high level of generality on all sides of the square. In English courses, student writers could never get away with an endless stream of generalities lacking context (at least not until graduate school) but such talk set the tone at this Regents meetings. Given the vagueness of the discussion, it is understandable that the Regents often miss connections between reality and the business of the University, even when discussing money, supposedly their specialty since they have all made a lot of it.

What surprised me most was how genuinely appreciative of the exchange of banalities the regents and chancellors seemed to be. Everyone agreed how enormously valuable the session had been. Apparently this vacuous forum was just what they wanted and needed before turning to lunch and then to the management of the great University of California as it lurches toward penury and decline.

In February the Regents will be meeting at UCR. I urge you all to go to the meeting and observe the men and a few women who run the institution we hope will continue to flourish. Leave your whistles, posters, and specific questions at the door.

UC-AFT Local 1966 Officers

President: Cynthia Tuell, English
 Vice-president: Barbara Bennett, Music
 Treasurer: Barbara Gable, English
 Secretary: Deloy Simper, English
 Librarian Representative: Dick Vierich,
 Bioag Library
 Senate Faculty Representative: Dave
 Fairris, Economics
 Grievance Committee:
 Dick Vierich, Bioag Library

About The Slateboard

This newsletter is funded by Local 1966 of the University Council-American Federation of Teachers. It appears quarterly and is distributed to all teaching faculty, librarians, union local presidents, and Campus Coalition of Concern members on the UCR campus. The editors will print articles on labor relations and other matters of interest to these groups.

The editorial board is made up of members of Local 1966. Opinions are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the editorial board, the Local officers, or the UC-AFT. We encourage submissions of articles and letters from other members of the campus community. Bring items to the editor, Barbara Gable, English.